

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-17 and 20-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-17 and 20-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. The Final Office Action mailed on October 19, 2007 has been noted, and its contents carefully studied. The undersigned representative respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 in light of these remarks/arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4-12, 15-17, 20-22, and 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saare (US Pub No 2005/0015772) in view of Omori (US Pub No 2002/0184405) and claims 13, 14, 23, and 24 stand rejected as being obvious over Saare in view of Omori and Pace (US Pub No 2003/0101223). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claims 1, 4-12, 15-17, 20-22, and 25-30, the proposed modification of Saare in view of Omori, the deficiencies of each of which have been pointed out in previous papers filed in this application, lacks one or more limitations recited in each of independent claims 1 and 17 in at least the following respects:

- Paragraphs 2, 51, and 56 of Saare, cited by the Examiner in rejecting independent claims 1 and 17, describe a web portal running on a server and propose selecting a helper module to link a channel with a particular application depending on the type of device accessing the web server and to act as an adapter between the coding of the two. However, nothing in the cited passages of Saare discloses or suggests the method for managing workflow for an application that involves obtaining an application adapter associated with the application, which application adapter specifies a sub-task, monitoring the application to obtain a state, and performing an action associated with the sub-task if the state is associated with the sub-task, as recited in independent claim 1, and/or the system for managing workflow for an application that involves an application that comprises a state, an application adapter configured to define an action associated with the state, and an application adapter runtime configured to monitor the

- application and perform the action when the state is encountered, as recited in independent claim 17.
- Paragraphs 40 and 59 of Sarre, likewise cited by the Examiner in rejecting independent claims 1 and 17, propose a portal server storing a user's log-in credentials, privileges and associated server names to enable the portal server to redirect the user's browser, e.g., to e-mail or other web portal channels. However, nothing in the cited passages of Sarre teaches or suggests the method for managing workflow for an application that involves authenticating a user, retrieving a single sign-on profile associated with the user if the user is authenticated, which single sign-on profile comprises the application adapter that specifies a sub-task and is associated with the application, as recited in independent claim 1 and/or the system for managing workflow for an application that involves an authentication infrastructure configured to authenticate a user and retrieve a single sign-on profile associated with the user when the user is authenticated, which single sign-on profile comprises the application adapter that is configured to define an action associated with the state that the application comprises, as recited in independent claim 17.
 - The Examiner admits that Saare fails to disclose monitoring the application to obtain a state and performing an action associated with the sub-task, if the state is associated with the sub-task, as recited in independent claim 1, and an application that comprises a state, an application adapter configured to define an action associated with the state, and an application adapter runtime configured to monitor the application and perform the action when the state is encountered, as recited in independent claim 17. Omori fails to remedy the deficiencies of Saare. Paragraphs 22, 124, and 133 of Omori, also cited by the Examiner in rejecting independent claims 1 and 17, propose providing recorded data representing an operation state of an application service provider to additional functions of the service provider, a back-end linkage that monitors, activates or stops processing for the service provider, and realizing the linkage by monitoring the process state of the service provider's applications. However, nothing in Saare and/or the cited passages of Omori discloses or suggests the method for managing workflow for

an application that involves monitoring the application to obtain a state and performing an action associated with the sub-task if the state is associated with the sub-task, as recited in independent claim 1, and/or the system for managing workflow for an application that involves an application that comprises a state, an application adapter configured to define an action associated with the state, and an application adapter runtime configured to monitor the application and perform the action when the state is encountered, as recited in independent claim 17.

Consequently, Saare and/or Omori, separately or in combination with one another, do not recite the required combination of limitations of independent claims 1 and/or 17. Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach the limitations of independent claims 1 and/or 17, the Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A., 1974) (holding that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires the references to teach all of the limitations of the rejected claim); See also MPEP 52143.03. The Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability for independent claims 1 and/or 17 and similarly has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for claims 4-12, 15-16 that depend on claim 1 and claims 20-22, and 25-30 that depend on claim 17, and which recite further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence with the references.

Regarding claims 13, 14, 23 and 24, the proposed modification of Saare in view of Omori and Pace lacks one or more limitations recited in each of claims 13 and 14 depending on independent claim 1 and claims 23 and 24 depending on independent claim 17 in at least the following respects:

- For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 17, Saare and Omori do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to any of claims 13 or 14 depending on independent claim 1 or claims 23 or 24 depending on independent claim 17 because Saare and/or Omori do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1 on which claims 13 and 14 depend or of independent claim 17 on which claims 23 and 24 depend. Since claims 13 and 14 are dependent on allowable independent claim 1 and

claims 23 and 24 are dependent on allowable independent claim 17, and since Pace, which merely discloses use of the term “dynamic link library”, does not cure the deficiencies of Saare and/or Omori, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for claims 13 or 14 that depend on claim 1 or claims 23 or 24 that depend on claim 17, and which recite further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence with the references.

Consequently, Sarre and/or Omori and/or Pace, separately or in combination with one another, do not recite the required combination of limitations of claims 13 or 14 that depend on claim 1 or claims 23 or 24 that depend on claim 17. Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach the limitations of claims 13 or 14 that depend on claim 1 or claims 23 or 24 that depend on claim 17, the Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A., 1974) (holding that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires the references to teach all of the limitations of the rejected claim); See also MPEP 52143.03.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks/arguments, each of the claims remaining in the application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection and to pass the application to issue. Should the Office feel that contacting the undersigned representative will aid in expediting the prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to do so at the number provided below. If any fees are required in connection with this filing, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4402.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 22, 2008

By: /John M. Harrington, Reg. #25,592/
John M. Harrington
(Reg. No. 25,592)

KING & SPALDING LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-8978